

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment is submitted to emphasize the differences between the claimed invention and the lottery ticket disclosed in the Walker reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,250,685). Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that there are a plurality of rows in the first game area and a matching set of plurality of rows in a second game area such that each match of one row from the first game area and one row from the second game area constitutes a single game row in which a game is played and a prize may be awarded.

Claim 1 requires a plurality of such games. As indicated in subparagraph d) of claim 1, means are provided for playing each of the single game rows in the first game area to see if a prize has been won. Thus, the present invention is directed to a multi-game lottery ticket in which each row of the lottery ticket constitutes a separate game which must be played by the player to determine if a prize has been won.

This is not the case with the Walker reference. In particular, all of the claims (claims 1 and 3-8) stand rejected over the Walker reference. In particular, Walker is described as disclosing a first game area 120 having a row 120E and a second game area 130 having a row 130E. It is stated that the same number of rows in the game area 120 also appear in the game area 130 and that there is a prize area

comprising prize designations for the row of the first game. The rejection is hereby traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Reference is made to Figures 1 and 2 of Walker and the description in the reference patent beginning at column 8, line 38. The first game area referred to in the Office Action is referred to in the reference as a strategy section 120 and is used to indicate a plurality of strategies for the game. As shown in Figure 2, there are three strategies in the first game area 120 with the player required to select only one of them. More specifically, column 8, lines 49-56 indicate that there are three strategies available to the player to use during the game. However, it is stated that the player would be able to exercise an element of skill by considering the strategies and deciding which strategy (i.e. only one strategy) to use. Thus, when the player begins the game in accordance with the instructions, he exposes all three strategies and considers which strategy should be selected taking into consideration the draw of cards set forth in section 110.

As indicated beginning at column 9, line 1 each outcome is associated with a corresponding one of the strategies contained in the strategy section. In the embodiment of Figures 1 and 2, there are three possible outcomes for the game each of which corresponds to one of the three strategies. The outcome for the game is determined by the player selecting the outcome that corresponds to the strategy he decides to use. Thus, the player must select a single strategy and then he selects (by removing the scratch-off layer) a single outcome.

The payout section 140 is used to indicate one of a plurality of payouts that the player may obtain for the game. Each payout is associated with a corresponding one of the outcomes (column 9, beginning at line 19). As indicated at page 9, beginning at line 33, the payout for the game is determined by the player selecting the payout that corresponds to the selected outcome for the game, which corresponds to the strategy he decides to you. Thus, the Walker game is a single game ticket in which the player must select from a plurality of different rows a suitable strategy, corresponding outcome and corresponding payout.

Contrary to what is disclosed in Walker, the present invention provides for multiple games between two game areas wherein a complete game is played by completing the row in the first game area with an adjacent row in the second game area. The player proceeds to play all of the games on the ticket. Thus, if there are six rows in the first game area, there are six matching rows in the second game area and each is played for a total of six games.

The Office Action states on page 4 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate as many rows, play indicia and means for selecting each of the rows for each game area as desired by the end user. This statement when applied to the Walker reference would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to add more strategies, more outcomes and more payout possibilities for the user to select for the purpose of playing a single game. If the same logic is applied to the present invention, one of ordinary skill in the art could add additional first game area rows, second game area rows to increase the number of games that the user

ARK:jsg083105/1591847.AMD-6

could play. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would not arrive at the claimed invention (a multi-game ticket) from Walker because Walker does not teach or suggest multiple games with each game being played on a single row obtained from matching first game area rows and second game area rows. This is because the Walker ticket is limited to a single game.

It is therefore submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and early passage to issue is therefore deemed proper and is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this matter. However, if any fee is due, it should be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-0510.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen R. Kipnes, Esquire  
Registration No. 28,433  
Attorney for Applicant

Address All Correspondence to:

Allen R. Kipnes, Esquire  
WATOV & KIPNES, P.C.  
P.O. Box 247  
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550  
(609) 243-0330